

1 This selecting and copying is accomplished by clicking on the toolbar 50 icon 53 or by
2 using a dropdown menu. This brings up another toolbar 70 (FIG. 3) that contains a
3 plurality of icons 71-81, each representing one of the training modules available on the
4 instructor's computer 30. In the exemplary embodiment of a CIC simulation, such
5 modules may comprise a tactical display system (TDS) 71, TDS/radar 72, Aegis 73,
6 sonar geographical situation (GEOSIT) 74, sonobuoy GEOSIT 75, towed array
7 communication (TA GRAM) 76, sonobuoy GRAM 77, electronic warfare (EW) 78,
8 antisurface warfare (ASUW) 79, communications 80, and DRT 81. (Emphasis added,
9 Kotick, column 5, lines 17-29.)

10 The Examiner has not indicated which portion of this citation he believes teaches applicants'
11 recited claim step, but applicants note in the underlined portion above, that Kotick teaches
12 representing one of the training modules *available* on the instructor's computer 30. If the Examiner
13 believes that the *available* training module displayed on toolbar 70 is equivalent to applicants'
14 recitation of "a palette comprising a control only for an available property," the Examiner should note
15 that the property recited in Claim 1 is a property "for an electronic document." This distinction is
16 now specifically recited in applicants' claim, as amended. Thus, to meet the language of applicants'
17 claim, any property that is available must be an available property *for the electronic document*. In
18 further contrast, Kotick does NOT teach or suggest an electronic document, but instead teaches a
19 "virtual space," which is not equivalent to an electronic document. Kotick teaches that "software
20 is adapted to create and display on the instructor's screen 32 *at least one virtual space* containing at
21 least some of the workstations" (Kotick, column 4, lines 33-35). But since a virtual space is NOT
22 equivalent to an electronic document, applicants are hard pressed to understand why Kotick is even
23 pertinent to their claims.

24 In addition, as noted in applicants' Office Action response dated July 19, 2006, on page 10,
25 lines 8-10, Buxton does NOT teach or suggest creating a customized palette for the user interface so
26 that the palette comprises a control only for an available property for the electronic document.
27 Buxton is instead directed towards a method of treating unavailable action items.

28 Accordingly, the rejection of independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kotick in view
29 of Buxton should be withdrawn because neither cited reference teaches or suggests all of the recited claim
30 elements. Because dependent claims inherently include all of the elements of the independent claims
from which the dependent claims ultimately depend, and because Kotick in view of Buxton does not
disclose or suggest all of the elements of independent Claim 1, the rejection of dependent Claims 2-13

under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kotick in view of Buxton should be withdrawn, for at least the same reasons as the rejection of Claim 1.

Patentability of Independent Claim 14

Significant differences also exist between the recitation of independent Claim 14 and the cited art because the cited art does not teach that the palette and an activated associated content of the palette do not obscure any portion of the viewing content area occupied by the electronic document *regardless of whether the electronic document occupies all portions of the viewing content area* as recited in the last subparagraph related to functionality of the processing unit.

The Examiner has asserted that Figure 3A, items 300 and 320 of Buxton teach this recitation. However, please note that in FIGURE 3A there is no activated associated content of a palette. Furthermore, FIGURE 3B of Buxton shows that "Selection of a Main Menu item 326 results in a Pop-Up Menu of Quick-pick items 328" (Buxton, column 6, lines 64-65). Similarly, FIGURE 3C of Buxton shows that "Quick-pick items 328 appear in a Pop-Up palette 330 of choices from Action Bar 322" (Buxton, column 6, lines 66-67). If the Examiner believes that the Pop-Up Menu and Pop-Up palette are equivalent to applicants' activated associated content and that the memo is equivalent to applicants' electronic document, please note that the Pop-Up Menu and Pop-Up palette obscure portions of the viewing content area occupied by the memos, regardless of whether the memos occupy all portions of the viewing content area. Therefore, neither the Pop-Up-Menu nor the Pop-Up palette meet the requirements for the palette and activated associated content of the palette as recited in Claim 14.

In addition, for the reasons given above in the traversal of the rejection of Claim 1, Kotick also does not teach this step, because Kotick does not even teach or suggest any equivalent to applicants' "electronic document."

Accordingly, the rejection of independent Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kotick in view of Buxton should be withdrawn. Because dependent claims inherently include all of the elements of the independent claims from which the dependent claims ultimately depend, and because Kotick in view of Buxton does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of independent Claim 14, the rejection of dependent Claims 15-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kotick in view of Buxton should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as the rejection of Claim 14.

1 Patentability of Independent Claim 27

2 Independent Claim 27 is directed toward a computer system for providing a selection of
3 formatting properties for an electronic document associated with an application program having a
4 user interface. Significant differences exist between the recitation of independent Claim 27 and the
5 cited art because the cited art does not teach that “the modified palette and an activated associated
6 content of the modified palette do not obscure any portion of the viewing content area occupied by
7 the electronic document *regardless of whether the electronic document occupies all portions of the*
8 *viewing content area*” as recited in the last subparagraph related to functionality of the processing
9 unit. The Examiner has rejected Claim 27 under the same rationale as Claim 14. Therefore, for the
10 same reasons presented above in traversing the rejection of independent Claim 14, independent Claim 27
11 also distinguishes over the cited art. Kotick does not cure this deficiency, since Kotick does not even
12 teach an electronic document. Accordingly, the rejection of independent Claim 27 under
13 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kotick in view of Buxton should be withdrawn.

14 In view of the Remarks set forth above, it will be apparent that the claims remaining in this
15 application define a novel and non-obvious invention, and that the application is in condition for
16 allowance and should be passed to issue without further delay. Should any further questions remain,
17 the Examiner is invited to telephone applicants’ attorney at the number listed below.

18
19 Respectfully submitted,

20
21 /sabrina k. macintyre/
22 Sabrina K. MacIntyre
23 Registration No. 56,912
24

25 SKM/RMA:clm
26
27
28
29
30